Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/930,482	DRISKELL, STACY JEAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Donald Heckenberg	1722
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) William Gosz (Applicant's Rep.).	(3)	
(2) <u>Donald Heckenberg (PTO Exmr.)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 May 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  N/A		
Claims discussed: 22-25		
Prior art documents discussed:  N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writto ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	onature – if appropriate)
יייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייי	pp.iioarii o rioprodomaniya Ol	Silerato il abbiobilato)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exmr. Heckenberg noted that it appeared that inadvertent change had been made to dependency of claims 22-25 in the amendment filed 16 March 2006 and suggested amendment to correct problem arisen with claim 22, and change claims 23-25 back to original form. Mr. Gosz agreed (see Examiner's Amendment).